



2121

John

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No.: 09/717,332

Filed: November 20, 2000

Examiner: J. Hirl

Art Unit: 2121

Inventor: Josephson, et al.

Title: MULTICRITERIAL DECISION
MAKING SYSTEM AND
METHODAttorney OSU1159-074D
Docket:TELEPHONE INTERVIEW
SUMMARYMail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(A)

Date of Deposit: December 22, 2004

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as regular mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Kim B. Powers
Kim B. Powers

Sir:

Pursuant to MPEP 713.04, Applicant is submitting this summary of the substance of the November 17, 2004 telephone interview with Examiner Hirl.

REMARKS

On November 17, 2004 at 2:00 PM, Dr. John Josephson, Inventor, and Carol Stovsky, Applicant's representative, participated in a telephone interview with Examiner Hirl to discuss the present application. Prior to the interview, a response to the last office action was filed.

The participants discussed double patenting and 35 U.S.C. § 101 claim rejections in the last office action. The Examiner stated that his preliminary review of the filed response indicated that the double patenting and § 101 claim rejections had been addressed.

The participants also discussed claim 1 and the Amado reference. In the latest response, the pending claims were amended to indicate that candidates according to the present invention are alternatives within a decision space, that the filter of the present invention compares each candidate in the decision space to other candidates to exclude inferior candidates so that the remaining candidates represent tradeoffs within the decision space, and that the viewer of the present invention allows a computer user to examine the tradeoffs and select the candidate or candidates that have the attributes that the user considers to be the most important. It was submitted to the Examiner that the Amado reference did not teach a system for exploring a decision space in which candidates that are alternatives within the decision space are filtered to exclude inferior candidates. The Examiner expressed concerns about the scope of the claim language

and suggested that using "means for" language in the claims would tie the language to the disclosure.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 22, 2004

By: Carol G. Stovsky
Carol G. Stovsky
Registration No.: 42,171
Standley Law Group LLP
495 Metro Place South, Suite 210
Dublin, Ohio 43017-5319
Tel.: 614-792-5555
Fax: 614-792-5536
cstovsky@standleyllp.com